UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/635,677	08/07/2003	Yoshiharu Komatsu	Q76889	1774

23373 7590 09/04/2007

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER	
SHAN, APRIL YING	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2135	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/635,677	KOMATSU, YOSHIHARU	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	April Y. Shan	2135	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 June 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-72* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-72* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *3/2007*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The Applicant's amendment, filed 20 June 2007, has been received, entered into the record, respectfully and fully considered.

2. As a result of the amendment, claims 1-72 have been amended. Claims 1-72 are now presented for examination.

3. Any **objections** are not repeated below are withdrawn due to Applicant's amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 1-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

As per **claims 1, 2, 3, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53 and 54** the Applicant added new claim limitations "first external device", "second external device", "first device identification information" and "second device identification information".

The Examiner carefully and respectfully reviewed the Applicant's original disclosure and cannot find support there are two different external devices and two different information. The original disclosure merely discloses two steps to obtaining external device identification information.

As per claims **4, 6, 28, 30 and 52** the Applicant added new claim limitation "a second combination of the device identification information". The original disclosure has no support on a second combination of the device identification information.

As per **claim 5**, "at least one of the device identification..." is being added. The original disclosure has no support on this claim limitation.

As per claims **49-72**, "A program recorded on a computer readable medium..." is being recited. The examiner carefully and respectfully reviewed the original disclosure and cannot find any support in the original disclosure in disclosing program "recorded on a computer readable medium".

The Applicant is required to point out where these amended claim limitations are in the original disclosure and please note **no new matter should be added** in the original disclosure in addressing this claim rejection.

Any claim not specifically addressed, above, is being rejected as incorporating the deficiencies of a claim upon which it depends.

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 1-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-72 are rejected under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112, because the instant claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

There are 112 second problem in all the claims 1-72, given an example in claim 1 "a module for associating the function limit with the device identification information of a prescribed external device to obtain a cryptographic key" is recited. However, there are two external devices are being recited in the claim. Then, which "the device identification of a prescribed external device" is being referring to?

The Applicant is advised to correct all the 112 2nd problems in claims 1-72. The Applicant is respectfully reminded that please **do not add new matter** while correcting 112 2nd problems in claims 1-72.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

8. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

9. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

In **claims 1 - 24**, an "electric apparatus" is being recited; however, it appears that the apparatus would reasonably be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art as software, per se. All claim limitations such as function limiting module, an interface, a determining modules and etc. are all software. Although the claims recite "a memory for storing...cryptographic key", memory can be reasonably interpreted as database, data structure or any software components capable of holding data. As such, it believes that the system of claims 1-24 are reasonably interpreted as functional descriptive material, per se.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

12. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-9, 11, 13-15, 17, 19-21, 23, 25-27, 29, 31-33, 35, 37-39, 41, 43-45, 47, 49-51, 53, 55-57, 59, 61-63, 65, 67-69 and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art (Japanese Patent

Application laid open No. HEI10-49493. Below rejection is based on English translation of the Japanese application provided by JPO) in view of Harada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,093,300)

As per **claims 1 and 25**, Admitted Prior Art '49493 discloses a method/equipment for preventing the unauthorized use of electric equipment including an interface to connect an external device thereto, comprising:

"...a computer and peripheral devices are provided with nonvolatile memories, respectively, for registering identification numbers. When one peripheral device is connected to the computer, the computer obtains a registration number from the connected peripheral device, and determines whether or not the registration number matches that of the computer. The computer allows a user the use of the peripheral device only when the two numbers match" (See Applicant's specification page 2, line 23 – page 3, line 2)

a first device identification information obtaining step for obtaining device identification information from an external device connected via the interface to the electric equipment to identify the device (See Applicant's specification page 2, line 23 – page 3, line 2 and Admitted Prior Art '49493, par. [0005]);

a second device identification information obtaining step for obtaining device identification information from an external device connected via the interface to the electric equipment to identify the device (See Applicant's specification page 2, line 23 – page 3, line 2 and Admitted Prior Art '49493, par. [0005]);

a determining step for determining whether or not the device identification information obtained at the second device identification information obtaining step matches the device identification information of the cryptographic key stored in the memory (See Applicant's specification page 2, line 23 – page 3, line 2 and Admitted Prior Art '49493, par. [0005], [007]-[0008]);

Applicant's admitted prior art '49493 doe not expressly disclose:

- a function limiting step for setting a function limit to the electric equipment so that at least part of functions of the electric equipment becomes unavailable,
- a step for associating the/each function limit with the device identification information obtained at the first device identification information obtaining step to thereby obtain a cryptographic key
- a step for storing the cryptographic key in a memory
- a limit canceling step for canceling the function limit set at the function limiting step when it is determined at the determining step that the information obtained at the second device identification information obtaining step matches the cryptographic key

Harada et al. discloses a function limiting step for setting a function limit to the electric equipment so that at least part of functions of the electric equipment becomes unavailable ("inoperable state setting means, in response to an output of the theft judging means, for, when the apparatus is judged as having been exposed to theft,

putting the electronic apparatus into an inoperable state against theft in which a predetermined operation of a controlled circuit is disabled" – e.g. col. 2, lines 25-29); a step for associating the/each function limit with the device identification information obtained at the first device identification information obtaining step to thereby obtain a cryptographic key ("To cancel such an inoperable state against theft of the controlled circuit of the electronic apparatus, the individual code A22 individually assigned to the electronic apparatus and stored in the individual code memory M22 is used. The individual code A22 is calculated in accordance with a predetermined first relationship, so that the output code A221 is obtained. With regard to this first relationship: (a) the value of the output code A221 may be the same as that of the individual code A22; (b) the individual code A22 may be subjected to calculation in accordance with a predetermined equation to obtain an output code A221 having a different value from that of the individual code A22; or (c) an output code A221 having a different value from that of the individual code A22 may be obtained in accordance with a preset table or the like. The output code A221 obtained in this way is output from the output means embodied by indication means or the like" – e.g. col. 2, line 61 – col. 3, line 10. Please note output code A221 corresponds to Applicant's cryptographic key); a step for storing the cryptographic key in a memory ("a nonvolatile individual code memory M22 for storing an individual code A22 individually assigned to the electronic apparatus" – e.g. col. 2, lines 30-32. Please note an individual code A22 corresponds to Applicant's cryptographic key); a limit canceling step for canceling the function limit set at the function limiting step when it is determined at the determining step that the information

obtained at the second device identification information obtaining step matches the cryptographic key ("and inoperable state canceling means for, when it is judged by the individual code relationship judging means that the individual judgment code B2 and the individual code A22 have the predetermined second relationship, canceling the inoperable state against theft of the controlled circuit" – e.g. col. 2, lines 38 - 43).

Applicant's admitted prior art '49493 and Harada et al. are analogous art since they are from the same field of theft prevention of electronic apparatus.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Harada et al.'s disclosed characters of method/system into Applicant's admitted prior art '49493.

The motivation of doing so would have been "to provide an electronic apparatus/method of canceling the inoperable state...caused to prevent theft, can be canceled at minimal effort and cost", as taught by Harada et al. (col. 2, lines 5-21)

As per **claims 7 and 31**, the combined teachings of Applicant's admitted prior art '49493 and Harada et al. disclose a method/electric equipment as applied above in claims 1 and 25. Applicant's admitted prior art '49493 further discloses comprising for having the external device store information that uniquely identifies the external device as the device identification information after the first device identification information obtaining step when the external device connected to the electric equipment at

the first device identification information obtaining step is capable of storing information (Applicant's admitted prior art '49493 – e.g. par. [0006]).

As per **claims 13 and 37**, the combined teachings of Applicant's admitted prior art '49493 and Harada et al. disclose a method/electric equipment as applied above in claims 1 and 25. Harada et al. further discloses resetting the function limit when a prescribed period of time has passed after the determining (Harada et al. - e.g. col. 11, lines 5-25).

As per **claims 19 and 43**, the combined teachings of Applicant's admitted prior art '49493 and Harada et al. disclose a method/electric equipment as applied above in claims 1 and 25. Applicant's admitted prior art '49493 - Harada et al. further discloses for having the external device store information that uniquely identifies the external device as the device identification information after the first device identification information obtaining step when the external device connected to the electric equipment at the first device identification information obtaining step is capable of storing information (Applicant's admitted prior art '49493– e.g. par. [0006]); and a step for resetting the function limit when a prescribed period of time has passed after the determining (Harada et al. - e.g. col. 11, lines 5-25).

As per **claims 2-3, 5** and **26-27, 29** they are rejected using the same rationale as rejecting claims 1 and 25 above.

As **per claims 8-9, 11** and **32-33, 35**, they are rejected using the same rationale as rejecting claims 7 and 31 above.

As per **claims 14-15, 17** and **38-39, 41** they are rejected using the same rationale as rejecting claims 13 and 37 above.

As per **claims 20-21, 23** and **44-45, 47** they are rejected using the same rationale as rejecting claims 19 and 43 above.

As per **claims 49-51, 53, 55-57, 59, 61-63, 65, 67-69 and 71**, the combined teachings of Applicant's admitted prior art '49493 and Harada et al. disclose the claimed method of steps as applied above in claims 25-27, 29, 31-33, 35, 37-39, 41, 43-45 and 47. Therefore, the combined teachings of Applicant's admitted prior art '49493 and Harada et al. disclose the claimed program built into the electric equipment for carrying out the method of steps.

13. Claims 4, 6, 10, 12, 16, 18, 22, 24, 28, 30, 34, 36, 40, 42, 46, 48, 52, 54, 58, 60, 64, 66, 70 and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art '49493- Harada et al. as applied to claims 1 and 25 above, and further in view of Bajikar (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0194500).

As per **claims 4 and 28**, Admitted Prior Art '49493 discloses a method/equipment for preventing the unauthorized use of electric equipment including an interface to connect an external device thereto, comprising:

"...a computer and peripheral devices are provided with nonvolatile memories, respectively, for registering identification numbers. When one peripheral device is connected to the computer, the computer obtains a registration number from the connected peripheral device, and determines whether or not the registration number matches that of the computer. The computer allows a user the use of the peripheral device only when the two numbers match" (See Applicant's specification page 2, line 23 – page 3, line 2)

a first device identification information obtaining step for obtaining device identification information from an external device connected via one of the interfaces to the electric equipment to identify the device (See Applicant's specification page 2, line 23 – page 3, line 2 and Admitted Prior Art '49493, par. [0005] and drawing 1);

a second device identification information obtaining step for obtaining device identification information from an external device connected via one of the interfaces to the electric equipment to identify the device (See Applicant's specification page 2, line 23 – page 3, line 2 and Admitted Prior Art '49493, par. [0005] and drawing 2);

Applicant's admitted prior art '49493 does not expressly disclose:

- a function limiting step for setting a function limit to the electric equipment so that at least part of functions of the electric equipment becomes unavailable,
- a first connection route information generating step for generating first connection route information indicating which interface is used to connect the external device

to the electric equipment at the first device identification information obtaining step

- a step for associating the/each function limit with a combination of prescribed device identification information and relevant connection route information to thereby obtain a cryptographic key
- a step for storing the cryptographic key in a memory
- a second connection route information generating step for generating second connection route information indicating which interface is used to connect the external device to the electric equipment at the second device identification information obtaining step
- a determining step for determining whether or not a combination of the device identification information obtained at the second device identification information obtaining step and the second connection route information matches the cryptographic key stored in the memory
- a limit canceling step for canceling the function limit set at the function limiting step when it is determined at the determining step that the combination of the obtained information and connection route information matches the cryptographic key

Harada et al. discloses a function limiting step for setting a function limit to the electric equipment so that at least part of functions of the electric equipment becomes unavailable ("inoperable state setting means, in response to an output of the theft judging means, for, when the apparatus is judged as having been exposed to theft,

putting the electronic apparatus into an inoperable state against theft in which a predetermined operation of a controlled circuit is disabled" – e.g. col. 2, lines 25-29); a step for associating the/each function limit with the device identification information obtained at the first device identification information obtaining step to thereby obtain a cryptographic key ("To cancel such an inoperable state against theft of the controlled circuit of the electronic apparatus, the individual code A22 individually assigned to the electronic apparatus and stored in the individual code memory M22 is used. The individual code A22 is calculated in accordance with a predetermined first relationship, so that the output code A221 is obtained. With regard to this first relationship: (a) the value of the output code A221 may be the same as that of the individual code A22; (b) the individual code A22 may be subjected to calculation in accordance with a predetermined equation to obtain an output code A221 having a different value from that of the individual code A22; or (c) an output code A221 having a different value from that of the individual code A22 may be obtained in accordance with a preset table or the like. The output code A221 obtained in this way is output from the output means embodied by indication means or the like" – e.g. col. 2, line 61 – col. 3, line 10. Please note output code A221 corresponds to Applicant's cryptographic key); a step for storing the cryptographic key in a memory ("a nonvolatile individual code memory M22 for storing an individual code A22 individually assigned to the electronic apparatus" – e.g. col. 2, lines 30-32. Please note an individual code A22 corresponds to Applicant's cryptographic key); a determining step for determining whether or not the device

identification information obtained at the second device identification information obtaining step matches the device identification information of the cryptographic key stored in the memory ("individual code relationship judging means for judging whether the individual judgment code B2 input by the input means and the individual code A22 have a predetermined second relationship" – e.g. col. 2, lines 35-38); a limit canceling step for canceling the function limit set at the function limiting step when it is determined at the determining step that the information obtained at the second device identification information obtaining step matches the cryptographic key ("and inoperable state canceling means for, when it is judged by the individual code relationship judging means that the individual judgment code B2 and the individual code A22 have the predetermined second relationship, canceling the inoperable state against theft of the controlled circuit" – e.g. col. 2, lines 38 - 43).

Applicant's admitted prior art '49493 and Harada et al. are analogous art since they are from the same field of theft prevention of electronic apparatus.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Harada et al.'s disclosed characters of method/system into Applicant's admitted prior art '49493.

The motivation of doing so would have been "to provide an electronic apparatus/method of canceling the inoperable state...caused to prevent theft, can be canceled at minimal effort and cost", as taught by Harada et al. (col. 2, lines 5-21)

The combined teachings of Applicant's admitted prior art '49493 and Harada et al. do not expressly disclose:

- a first connection route information generating step for generating first connection route information indicating which interface is used to connect the external device to the electric equipment at the first device identification information obtaining step

- a second connection route information generating step for generating second connection route information indicating which interface is used to connect the external device to the electric equipment at the second device identification information obtaining step
- combination of the obtained information and connection route information

Bajikar discloses a first connection route information generating step for generating first connection route information indicating which interface is used to connect the external device to the electric equipment at the first device identification information obtaining step and a second connection route information generating step for generating second connection route information indicating which interface is used to connect the external device to the electric equipment at the second device identification information obtaining step and combination of the obtained information and connection route information (e.g. abstract, claims 1, 2 and 4. Please note

Bajikar's a plurality of Bluetooth Access Points corresponds to Applicant's multiple interfaces)

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Bajikar's disclosed characters of method/system into Applicant's admitted prior art '49493 – Harada et al.

The motivation of doing so would have been to provide "a new type of asset security and wireless tracking system for electronic devices such as portable computers...to provide access control, tracking and security services of varying complexity without any additional hardware overheads", as taught by Bajikar par. [0007].

As per **claims 10 and 34**, the combined teachings of Applicant's admitted prior art '49493 - Harada et al. – Bajikar disclose a method/electric equipment as applied above in claims 4 and 28. Applicant's admitted prior art '49493 further discloses comprising for having the external device store information that uniquely identifies the external device as the device identification information after the first device identification information obtaining step when the external device connected to the electric equipment at the first device identification information obtaining step is capable of storing information (Applicant's admitted prior art '49493 – e.g. par. [0006]).

As per **claims 16 and 40**, the combined teachings of Applicant's admitted prior art '49493 - Harada et al. – Bajikar disclose a method/electric equipment as applied above in claims 4 and 28. Harada et al. further discloses resetting the function limit

when a prescribed period of time has passed after the determining (Harada et al. - e.g. col. 11, lines 5-25).

As per **claims 22 and 46**, the combined teachings of Applicant's admitted prior art '49493 - Harada et al. – Bajikar disclose a method/electric equipment as applied above in claims 4 and 28. Applicant's admitted prior art '49493 - Harada et al. further discloses for having the external device store information that uniquely identifies the external device as the device identification information after the first device identification information obtaining step when the external device connected to the electric equipment at the first device identification information obtaining step is capable of storing information (Applicant's admitted prior art '49493– e.g. par. [0006]); and a step for resetting the function limit when a prescribed period of time has passed after the determining (Harada et al. - e.g. col. 11, lines 5-25).

As per **claims 6 and 30**, they are rejected using the same rationale as rejecting claims 4 and 28 above.

As per **claims 12 and 36**, they are rejected using the same rationale as rejecting claims 10 and 34 above.

As per **claims 18 and 42**, they are rejected using the same rationale as rejecting claims 16 and 40 above.

As per **claims 24 and 48**, they are rejected using the same rationale as rejecting claims 22 and 46 above.

As per **claims 52, 54, 58, 60, 64, 66, 70 and 72**, the combined teachings of Applicant's admitted prior art '49493 and Harada et al. and Bajikar disclose the claimed method of steps as applied above in claims 28, 30, 34, 36, 40, 42, 46 and 48. Therefore, the combined teachings of Applicant's admitted prior art '49493 and Harada and Bajikar et al. disclose the claimed program built into the electric equipment for carrying out the method of steps.

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments filed on 20 June 2007 have been respectfully and fully considered but they are not persuasive.

15. The Applicant's essential arguments are summarized as below:

- The Applicant argues on pages 49-52 "The Examiner cites the assigning of the code A22 in Harada for teaching a module for associating the function limit...of a prescribed external device to obtain a cryptographic key...Claim 1 recites setting a function limit to the electric apparatus...obtaining a device identification from an external device...Therefore, Harada fails to teach or suggest that the "identification code A22" is from an external device as recited in claim 1", the examiner respectfully disagrees.

First, according to the original record of rejection, the examiner did not cite Harada to disclose "obtaining a device identification from an external device ...". The examiner clearly rejected this claim limitation by citing Applicant's Admitted Prior Art '49493, par. [0005] and Applicant's specification on page 2, line 23 – page 3, line 2. Therefore, the Applicant is respectfully reminded that one cannot show

nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combination of references. See In re Keller, 642 F. 2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F. 2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Second, Harada does disclose the "function limit is of the electronic apparatus" by disclosing "In the event that **an electronic apparatus having a security function is forcibly put into an inoperable state**..." – e.g. abstract and "inoperable state setting means, in response to an output of the theft judging means, for, when **the apparatus** is judged as having been exposed to theft, **putting the electronic apparatus** into an inoperable state against theft in which a predetermined operation of a controlled circuit is disabled" – e.g. col. 2, lines 25-29.

Third, according to the original record of rejection, unlike the Applicant's argument on page 50 of "the Examiner asserts that the identification code A22 correspond to recited "device identification", the examiner did not assert such statement at all. Instead, the examiner asserts that "an individual A22 corresponds to Applicant's cryptographic key" on page 8 of the original record of rejection.

Fourth, Harada does teach "associating the function limit with the device identification information of...external device..." by disclosing "...the inoperable state can be canceled by using **a code** notified by the dealer by telephone, **without carrying the electronic apparatus** in its dealer...and its TOC information is used as a judgmental identification code C1..." – e.g. abstract.

- The Applicant argues Bajikar fails to teach or suggest "a module for generating connection route information indicating which interface... and the Bajikar does

not teach nor the Examiner provide any real reasoning...teach a determining module..." on pages 53-55 of the remark, the examiner respectfully disagrees.

First, according to the original record of rejection, the examiner cited Harada to disclose "a determining module..." The examiner clearly rejected this claim limitation by citing "individual code relationship judging means for judging whether the individual judgment code B2 input by the input means and the individual code A22 have a predetermined second relationship" – e.g. col. 2, lines 35-38. Therefore, the Applicant is respectfully reminded that one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combination of references. See In re Keller, 642 F. 2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F. 2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Second, Bajikar discloses "a module for generating connection route information indicating which interface..." by disclosing "...wherein said security server obtains attribute information of said secured device, including an unique device identification and a last known location of said secured device...and sends location information of a designated BTAP...to said secured device, via said designated BTAP (e.g. abstract, claims 1, 2 and 4. Please note Bajikar's a plurality of Bluetooth Access Points corresponds to Applicant's multiple interfaces) and further such claim limitations are common knowledge in the art having no patentable feature at all and it only produce predictable results.

- Regarding Applicant's argument on dependent claims being allowable due to dependency on pages 50-55 of the remark. However, because the arguments for the independent claims are traversed, the dependent claims are also not allowable.

Conclusion

16. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to April Y. Shan whose telephone number is (571) 270-1014. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m., EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y. Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

1 September 2007
AYS

KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100